arXiv:1702.00559v2 [physics.bio-ph] 13 Feb 2017

Possible scenarios of DNA double helix unzipping process

Oleksii Zdorevskyi, Sergey N. Volkov
Bogolyubov Institute for Theoretical Physics, NAS of Ukraine,
14-b Metrolohichna Str., Kiev 03143, Ukraine
snvolkov@bitp.kiev.ua

February 14, 2017

Abstract

Analysis of single-molecule micromanipulation experiments of DNA unzipping process shows some features of the force-distance curve, namely two consequent plateaus in the area of $\sim 12 - 14pN$ dependent on nucleotide sequence structure, as well as peaks appearance in the plateau area, to which it was not paid essential attention earlier. Using atom-atom potential function method the estimations of Watson-Crick base pairs opening energies are made. On the basis of this results two possible scenarios of the DNA double helix unzipping process are proposed. According to the first scenario DNA unzipping takes place slowly and as equilibrium process, with small difference between two plateaus on the unzipping curve. In this case firstly base pairs transit into the 'pre-opened' metastable state along the 'opening' pathway and then open along the 'stretch' pathway. Our estimations show that an important factor for the realization of this scenario is the existence of double-stranded DNA coil in the unopened part of DNA. The second scenario is characterized by higher opening force. In this scenario base pairs open directly along the 'stretch' pathway as non-equilibrium process. The conditions of the first scenario realization show that it can play a key role in the understanding of the DNA unzipping *in vivo* during transcription and genetic information transfer processes.

1 Introduction

The appearance of single-molecule micromanipulation methods [1] made it possible to investigate biological macromolecules, considering it as a separate system. These methods use optical tweezers [2], microneedles [3], atomic force microscopes [5]. Single-molecule micromanipulation methods allow to study processes such as DNA stretching, bending, twisting [4, 6, 7] and the DNA double helix nucleic base pairs opening [3, 8, 15–19]. Among them especially important is the process of sequential separation of nucleic bases in DNA base pairs under the action of external forces (DNA unzipping), which plays a key role in the genetic information transferring process.

At the early studies separation of bases in DNA double helix nucleic pairs (*bp*) was identified as the process of denaturation of macromolecules under the temperature influence. This process is called DNA melting [9–11]. In this case the process of base pairs opening is not sequential and the denaturation takes place in DNA sites which have different size and location. Firstly base pairs in A·T-rich sites open, and then - in G·C-rich sites. In contrast to the melting

process, single-molecule micromanipulation methods make it possible to investigate the process of sequential opening of DNA base pairs in the same way as it takes place in cell *in vivo*.

In the physical experiment of the unzipping process, which is carried out by the single-molecule micromanipulation methods, the dependence of the opening force on the opening distance is measured [3,15–21]. For λ-phage DNA at small pulling velocities ($\sim 40 nm/s$) the strand separation starts to take place after reaching by the force of a some critical value ($\sim 13 pN$). For this force value two consequent plateaus at $\sim 13 pN$ and $\sim 12 pN$ are observed and force peaks $\sim 1 pN$ in the plateau area occur ('sawtooth' nature of the DNA unzipping process) [15]. For big velocities ($\geq 1 \mu m/sec$) the plateau has a bigger value and hysteresis is observed [17].

The DNA unzipping process has been studied theoretically [3, 16, 21–23]. By Bockelmann et al. [3, 16] a model of the unzipping process which takes into consideration the opening energies of base pairs and the elastic energies of single strands is proposed. The authors managed to obtain the critical force value of $\sim 13 pN$. The peaks occurrence in the plateau area is considered as a molecular 'stick-slip motion' that takes place because of a heterogeneity of macromolecule. But this model does not describe the difference between two plateaus on the λ-DNA unzipping curve. Probably, the mechanism of the unzipping process can differ from that described in the works [3, 16]. In the present work it will be shown that the reason of its difference can be the base pair opening along different pathways.

The different pathways of base pairs opening are studied in the paper [23] where two-component model describing the DNA unzipping process is proposed. According to this model the DNA unzipping process takes place due to the creation of conformational bistability in the system under the external force action. As a result the process of the base pairs opening flows cooperatively.

The goal of the present work is to determine the physical processes that occur in DNA macromolecule during the DNA unzipping and to describe the experimental data on the qualitative and quantitative level. In Sec.2 the data from the single-molecule micromanipulation DNA unzipping experiment is analyzed and some features of the opening force-distance dependence that have not been explained in the previous theoretical models are determined. In Sec.3 using the atom-atom potential functions method A·T and G·C base pairs separation energies along different pathways are estimated. As the result it is determined that during the unzipping process DNA base pairs can open not only along the 'stretch' pathway, but under some conditions they can firstly transit into a metastable state along the 'opening' pathway, and then fully open along the 'stretch' pathway.

2 Experimental data analysis

In the single-molecule micromanipulation experiments the λ-phage DNA double helix is studied [3, 15–20]. It has a length of 48 502 bp. One end of one strand is attached to the substrate, and another strand from the same end - to the ball, which is held with a glass microneedle or optical trap. The scheme of the experiment is shown on Fig.1. From the other end double helix is not fixed and it forms a tertiary structure in the shape of a coil. Ball is moved with a constant speed, thus consequently opening the double helix. Than the dependence of the applied force on the displacement of the ball is measured.

Let us analyse the curve structure (Fig.2) obtained in the [15, fig.3]. On the curve fragment B - C sharp increase of the force almost without changing of the distance is observed. This corresponds to the tension increase of the whole system until force reaches a certain critical



Figure 1: Scheme of the single-molecule micromanipulation DNA unzipping experiment [3, 15–20]. F - the force that acts on the area situated between the double-stranded DNA (dsDNA) coil and unzipping fork and its components F_x and F_y.

value, which corresponds to the bases separation in DNA nucleic pairs.

On the curve fragment C - D base pairs opening takes place. This fragment consists of two plateaus. In the first half of the double helix opening occurs on the average force value of $\sim 13pN$, and in the second half on $\sim 12pN$ (Fig.2). As seen, there are two different plateaus with a small difference in the critical force value.

It is known that the first half of λ-DNA consists mainly of G·C pairs, while the second half is dominated by A·T pairs. Therefore, the average opening force of the first half of λ-DNA will be close to the opening force of the G·C pair, and in the second half - to the opening force of the A·T pair. So, the unzipping of these two parts of λ-phage DNA should take place under different opening force. Really, as it is seen from the experiment the value of force difference is $\sim 1pN$ (Fig.2).

In the paper [3] a model for the DNA unzipping process is proposed. In the framework of this model, the force of the base pairs separation in the unzipping process of DNA double helix can be calculated as:

$$F = \frac{E_{pair} + 2E_{el}}{l} \ , \tag{1}$$

where E_{pair} is the the total energy of base pairs opening in the macromolecule, E_{el} is the extension energy of one single strand, l - total extension of the single strands. From freely-joined chain model: $E_{el} \approx 0.3 kcal/mol, l = 0.95nm$ [3]. In the paper [3] fitting parameters for A·T and G·C opening energies are used (see Tabl.1) and the average opening force of a polymer with 50% content of A·T and G·C pairs is estimated. It coincides with the experimental value (ΔF, Tabl.1).

However, if we estimate by this formula the opening forces of one pair in A·T- and G·C-containing polymers separately (F_{AT} and F_{GC} respectively), and calculate their difference $\Delta F =$

Table 1: Free opening energies of A·T and G·C base pairs, calculated in the corresponding works, the difference between the opening forces of A·T and G·C base pairs $\Delta F = F_{GC} - F_{AT}$ and the averange opening force $F_{av} = (F_{GC} + F_{AT})/2$. *fitting parameters in [3], **opening energies of A·T- and G·C- containing polymers, averaged over the nearest neighbors [13], ***our estimations using (1), ****calculated in [3].

	[3]	[12]	[13]	[21]
Conditions (t, °C;NaCl, mM)	25°C, 150mM	25°C,10^3 mM	37°C, 15 mM	25°C, 10^3 mM
G_{AT}, kcal/mol	-0.77*	-1.55**	-0.31**	-1.09**
G_{GC}, kcal/mol	-1.7*	-3.23**	-1.45**	-2.08**
$\Delta F, pN$***	7	12	8	7
F_{av}, pN	13****	22***	11***	16***



Figure 2: Schematic figure of the experimental dependence obtained in [15]. Our estimations reveal that two plateaus have a value of $\sim 12pN$ and $\sim 13pN$ and peaks have the height of $\sim 1pN$ and the length of $\sim 100bp$; small peaks on the ascents of big peaks.

$F_{GC} - F_{AT}$, we will get a value which is large enough and does not coincide with the experimental difference between two plateaus of the value of $\sim 1pN$ (see. Tabl.1). If as E_{pair} parameters in formula (1) we take base pairs opening energies obtained from the DNA melting experiments [12, 13, 21] and then average them over all nearest neighbors, we will get a value of ΔF, which is $\sim 7 - 12pN$ and does not match the experimental data.

Note, in the works [12,21] the average opening force values $F_{av} = (F_{AT} + F_{GC})/2$ are inflated as well. As energy data calculated from the results of the DNA melting experiment, using of these energies may be incorrect for the unzipping process. Also experimental studying or short A·T and G·C DNA hairpins shows the difference $\Delta F \approx 10pN$ [8, 14] which is also close to the ΔF, obtained from the melting process studying (Tabl.1). These facts can reveal that the base pair opening in the processes of DNA melting and unzipping of short DNA hairpins can take place along the one pathway but in the process of λ-phage DNA unzipping at low pulling velocity along the another pathway.

Let us consider the plateau region in more detail. There are big peaks with the height $\sim 1pN$ and with the length $\sim 100bp$ up to $1000bp$ (Fig.2). It should be noted that the height of

the peaks reduces significantly to the end of the unzipping process.

On the ascent of these peaks even smaller peaks $\sim 10bp$ and up to $0.1pN$ are observed (Fig.2, [15, fig.6]). The values related to the size of small peaks are approximate because of the lack of resolution of available data. Shape of small peaks is characterized by a negative slope, as if a ball which is pulled, occasionally starts to move back. The negative slope can correspond to the position fluctuations of the ball in the optical trap. In the paper [21] frequency filters and short linkers that connect the DNA strands with ball and substrate are used allowing to avoid small peaks. On the descents of big peaks there are no small peaks. This means that the ball position fluctuations on ascends of big peaks arising occur because of the growth of tension in the system and descents of big peaks are followed by a decrease in tension, so there are no fluctuations on the descents of big peaks. This shows that the process of base pairs opening flows cooperatively on the descends of big peaks. As the small peaks are not related to the physical mechanism of the DNA unzipping they will not be discussed in the present paper any more, so 'big peaks' will be called simply 'peaks'.

Shape of the peaks presented on Fig.2 is uniform and periodic, however, due to the heterogeneity and aperiodicity of the coil-like tertiary structure of the λ-DNA double helix, the height and length of these peaks may be different from one to the other.

In the paper [40, p.548] it is noted that when force is less than $10pN$, opening of base pairs may not occur at all, but when force is $> 17pN$, base pair opening takes place very quickly and peaks on the obtained force-distance dependence reflect nucleotide sequence of the double helix. These opening force values can be obtained by increasing of the pulling speed [3, 16–19]. At speeds greater than $1\mu m/s$ unzipping process becomes to be non-equilibrium and a hysteresis is observed [17].

The process of the nucleic base pairs opening can be considered as a process of translational motion of the unzipping fork along the double helix [16]. The progressive movement of the fork is not uniform, and the size of the fork changes all the time. Using the statistical mechanics method [3] it is shown that unzipping fork is occasionally blocked and this is the reason of the force growth on the peaks. After that a cooperative process of base pairs opening takes place which corresponds to the forward movement of the unzipping fork and the descent of the peak. Our estimates (Fig.2) show that the probable length of the cooperative opening of DNA sites is in the range of several hundred pairs. At the same time in [3] the possible mechanism of the fork blocking and, as a result of the peak occurrence, is considered to be the heterogeneity of the macromolecule. But it should be noted, that heterogeneity can manifest itself in scale of several base pairs and can not be significantly noticeable on such big scales as several hundreds base pairs. As it will be shown in Sec.3, the presence of peaks may occur due to the coil-like tertiary structure of the closed part of DNA double helix in solution.

Thus, our analysis shows some important features of the DNA unzipping process, such as a difference between the critical opening forces for the two parts of λ-phage DNA, the presence of peaks and their shape characterize the unzipping process. These features require detailed physical explanation to understand all of the stages of the DNA unzipping process.



Figure 3: Base pair twist — the reason of the DNA double helix rotation during unzipping process.

3 Scenario of the DNA unzipping process. Some estimations

3.1 Mechanism of the peaks occurrence on the unzipping curve.

Let us consider the detailed shape of the force-distance curve in the plateau area. This section will show how to explain a scenario of the DNA unzipping process using the experimental results shown on Fig.2.

As the plateau consists of peaks, to understand the unzipping process scenario, let us consider the mechanism of peaks occurrence in detail. As it is known from the early study [28], the DNA unzipping process is accompanied by rotation of the double helix around its axis. Molecular dynamics methods [29] showed that this rotation happens due to the fact that the projection of each subsequent couple on a plane perpendicular to the axis of the double helix, is turned on an angle with respect to the previous (Fig.3). As it was already mentioned the unopened part of the DNA double helix has a coil-like shape in solution (Fig.1). So according to this scenario this coil must rotate during the unzipping process. At the beginning the tension that occurs in the DNA site situated between the fork and the coil is not enough to rotate the coil, but when the force reaches some threshold value, the coil is rotated and the tension disappears. From simple hydrodynamic considerations we can determine on which parameters the force required to rotate the coil at a certain angular velocity depends. The radius of the coil is given by:

$$R = \sqrt{2Ll_p}\ , \tag{2}$$

where L is the contour length, and $l_p = 50nm$ is the persistent length of DNA [30].

For simplicity we consider the coil as a smooth ball. Torque that should be applied to the ball of radius R in order to rotate it in the medium of a dynamic viscosity coefficient μ with the angular velocity ω, is as given by [31]:

$$|M| = 8\pi * 9.81 \mu\omega R^3\ . \tag{3}$$

As $M = FR$,

$$F \sim R^2 \sim L\ . \tag{4}$$



Figure 4: Degrees of freedom of nucleic bases in a pair of nucleotides (both movements take place in the plane of a pair): a) 'stretch' pathway b)'opening' pathway.

Since the contour length of the double helix decreases with the DNA opening, so this force, and therefore the peak height should decrease. This decrease in peak height is currently observed on the unzipping curve. While the peak height depends on the force of a coil rotation, the peak length is defined by other parameters. On the peak ascent unzipping fork is blocked [3], so the ascent length is mostly determined by the extension of single strands (Fig.1). The length of the descent is determined by the number of opened pairs.

The presence of peaks is also observed in the unpeeling process, when the force is applied at one end to one of the strands of the double helix, and at the other end both strands are fixed [32]. However, in the force-distance curve there are significant differences from the unzipping process. Firstly, the peak height increases at the end of the opening of λ-DNA. Secondly, compared with the unzipping process the height of peaks is much bigger. These features may also be connected with the coil mechanics. Unlike the unzipping process, coil size increases with opening of the double helix, so the height of peaks increases with the DNA opening. Significantly bigger peaks height (order of magnitude more than in the unzipping process) may occur due to the fact that in this process a coil rotates not around its own axis but around the axis of the helix, that significantly increases the hydrodynamic friction force.

These facts indicate that the presence of peaks on the force-distance curve of the DNA unzipping process can be related with the hydrodynamics of a coil-like tertiary structure of the DNA double helix in solution. Since a force required for rotating of this coil is proportional to the contour length of DNA in a coil (4) and in the experiment [15] (Fig.2) the long($\approx 50000bp$) λ-DNA is used for studying, this coil can play a significant role in the process of DNA unzipping. So coil mechanics can be the main reason of unzipping fork blocking mentioned in [3] and consequently of the peak occurence on the force-distance curve (Fig.2).

3.2 The possible pathways of the DNA unzipping process

Opening of nucleic base pairs can take place along different pathways [33]. Among them the most probable for the DNA unzipping process [23,29] are the 'stretch' pathway, when bases in a pair separate from each other along hydrogen bonds (Fig.4a), and the 'opening' pathway, when base pairs open into a groove (Fig.4b). Here all motions take place in the plane of a pair [29].

Let us consider that the process of base pairs opening may take place according to two scenarios: Watson-Crick pair opens along the 'stretch' pathway (Fig.5b) or Watson-Crick pair firstly transits into 'pre-opened' metastable state along the 'opening' pathway, and then fully opens along the 'stretch' pathway (Fig.5a).

As it was shown in Sec.3.1, this coil can play a significant role in the process of λ-DNA



Figure 5: Two possible scenarios of nucleic base pairs separation in DNA unzipping process: a) separation along the 'stretch' pathway from the state which is pre-opened along the 'opening' pathway; b) direct separation along the 'stretch' pathway.

unzipping. Base pair transition into a metastable state can occur in the area between the unzipping fork and a coil under the tension that creates external force from the one side and a coil from the other (F_y component on Fig.1). Under the influence of this tension double helix is stretched in this area, resulting in the weakening of stacking interactions between adjacent pairs, which mostly determines the stability of the double helix [13]. This allows base pairs to transit into the 'pre-opened' metastable state along the 'opening' pathway. This conformational transition in the area situated between the unzipping fork and a coil is natural due to the geometry of our system. So we consider that this transition does not require much energy and estimate the opening energy from the 'pre-opened' to the 'opened' state in this scenario. The existence of such a 'pre-opened' metastable state is shown in the works [23, 34, 35, 37].

Let us make some qualitative estimations of the energy required for base pair transition from Watson-Crick state to the opened state for A·T and G·C base pairs. In our estimations we consider that in the 'opening' pathway the rotation of bases takes place around the axis passing through the atom C_1' perpendicular to the plane of the base (Fig.6). As the 'stretch' pathway we consider a motion of bases in a pair relative to each other along the line connecting the C_1' atoms (Fig.6).

Let us define the parameters of these processes. We consider that the state becomes to be 'pre-opened' when the external hydrogen bond of a pair is broken (N_6H ••• O_4 for A·T and O_6 ••• HN_4 to G·C), i.e. the distance between the heavy atoms (N or O) and hydrogen atom reaches the value of the sum of their van der Waals radii. As the van der Waals radius of hydrogen atom is ≈1.2Å, nitrogen and oxygen are ≈1.5Å [38], this distance will be ≈2.7Å. Taking into account that the length of the covalent bond N-H ≈1Å [30], hydrogen bond will be broken when the distance between heavy atoms reaches ≈3.7Å. We consider that the full base pair opening takes place when the middle hydrogen bond (N_1 ••• N_3) is broken [10], i.e. the distance N_1N_3≈3.7Å. The estimations made in this section take into account only one degree of freedom: rotation of bases in a pair ('opening' pathway) or movement of bases relative to each



Figure 6: Schematic representation of the adenine-thymine nucleic base pair in DNA macromolecule: a) Watson-Crick configuration [30]. The arrow shows the 'opening' pathway: the bases rotation around the axis passing through atoms C_1' perpendicular to the plane of the pair; b) 'pre-opened' A·T pair mediated by the water molecule [34].

other along the hydrogen bonds ('stretch' pathway). However, in the experiment the movement along this pathways may take place involving other degrees of freedom ('twist', 'propeller', 'buckle', etc. [33]), which are not considered here to simplify the calculations because our aim is only to give the understanding of the physical mechanisms which take place in the DNA unzipping process.

To estimate the hydrogen bond stretching energy in Watson-Crick base pairs we use atom-atom potential functions method. Here we consider the pairwise interactions between the atoms which form hydrogen bonds. The energy of the hydrogen bond between atoms i and j is modeled by modificated Lennard-Jones potential [39]:

$$U\left(r_{ij}\right) = \frac{-A_{ij}}{r_{ij}^{10}} + \frac{B_{ij}}{r_{ij}^{12}} \tag{5}$$

Parameters A_{ij} and B_{ij} are also taken from [39], and for $H \bullet\bullet\bullet N$ are $A_{HN} = 9100\ kcal{*}\text{Å}^{10}/mol$, $B_{HN} = 27400\ kcal{*}\text{Å}^{12}/mol$, and for bond $H \bullet\bullet\bullet O$ $A_{HO} = 7350\ kcal{*}\text{Å}^{10}/mol$, $B_{HO} = 21400$

Table 2: Parameters for A·T and G·C Watson-Crick pairs. The hydrogen bond distance values and R distances are taken from [30]. The angles α_1, α_2 and binding energy E are calculated in this paper.

	N_6H ••• O_4 (A·T) O_6 ••• HN_4 (G·C), Å	N_1 ••• HN_3 (A·T) N_1H ••• N_3 (G·C), Å	C_2H ••• O_2 (A·T) N_2H ••• O_2 (G·C), Å	R, Å	$\alpha_1, grad$	$\alpha_2, grad$	$E, kcal/mol$
A·T	3.0	2.9	3.4	10.44	53.7	59.0	-4.72
G·C	2.9	3.0	2.9	10.72	58.4	56.5	-7.07

Table 3: Estimated in the present work distances and opening energies for pairs which are opening according to two scenarios: 'stretch' and 'stretch after opening' .

	N_6H ••• O_4 (A·T) O_6 ••• HN_4 (G·C), Å	N_1 ••• HN_3 (A·T) N_1H ••• N_3 (G·C), Å	C_2H ••• O_2 (A·T) N_2H ••• O_2 (G·C), Å	R, Å	$E, kcal/mol$
'stretch'					
A·T	3.7	3.6	4.2	0.8	4.0
G·C	3.7	3.7	3.7	0.8	6.4
'stretch after opening'					
A·T	4.2	3.7	4.04	0.5	1.7
G·C	4.1	3.7	3.7	0.4	2.0

$kcal{*}Å^{12}/mol$. Geometry of Watson-Crick pairs A·T and G·C is taken from [30]. For the A·T pair R distance between atoms C_1' is taken 10.44 Å, the angles between the glycosidic bond and R (α_1 and α_2) are calculated from the condition that Watson-Crick A·T pair in the closed state has the distance N_6H ••• O_4 of the value 2.9 Å, and the distance N_1 ••• HN_3 is 2.8 Å. For the pair G·C estimates are made in the similar way (see. Tabl.2). For A·T pair the shortened contact C_2H ••• O_2 is taken into account, which is also simulated by the potential (5).

Opening energy (E_{AT}, E_{GC}) is considered to be the difference between the energy of Watson-Crick configuration (energy minimum) and the configuration when central hydrogen bond is broken (Fig.7, red points). It should be noted that energy estimates in the present work are the same order of magnitude that obtained in the work [39, fig.3, curve 2].

As the result of the calculation (Tabl.3), the A·T pair opening energy for 'stretch' scenario is $E_{str}^{AT} \approx 4.0 kcal/mol$, and for 'stretch after opening' $E_{so}^{AT} \approx 1.7 kcal/mol$. At the same time for the G·C pair corresponding value for the 'stretch' scenario is $E_{str}^{GC} \approx 6.4 kcal/mol$, and for the 'stretch after opening' $E_{so}^{GC} \approx 2.0 kcal/mol$. That is to open a pair according to the 'stretch' scenario, it is required about 2-3 times more energy than to open it by 'stretch after opening' scenario. Also our estimates show that the opening of the G·C pair by the 'stretch' scenario needs $\Delta E_{str} \approx 2.4 kcal/mol$ more energy (see. Tabl.3) than opening of the A·T pair. At the same time, in the 'stretch after opening' scenario this difference is reduced to $\Delta E_{so} \approx 0.3 kcal/mol$. So the pair opening by the 'stretch after opening' scenario is much more energetically favorable than by the 'stretch' scenario. And heterogeneity plays a much less important role in the 'stretch after opening' scenario, than in the 'stretch' scenario. So in the 'stretch after opening' scenario the process of consequent base pairs opening can flow cooperatively.



Figure 7: Binding energy dependencies from distance calculated for A·T (dashed line) and G·C (solid line) base pairs for 'stretch' scenario. E_{AT}, E_{GC} - calculated opening energies as the difference between the Watson-Crick configuration (minimum) and configuration when central hydrogen bond (N_1 ••• N_3 distance) reaches 3.7 Å (red points), $\Delta E = E_{GC} - E_{AT}$.

Table 4: Our calculations of the value $\Delta E = E_{GC} - E_{AT}$, corresponding force differences ΔF measured by the method described in [3] and the corresponding experimental difference ΔF_{exp}. *estimated from DNA melting experiments (Tabl.1), **estimated from the experiment [15].

	$\Delta E, kcal/mol$	$\Delta F, pN$	$\Delta F_{exp}, pN$
'stretch'	2.4	16	7-12*
'stretch after opening'	0.3	2	1**

Now let us find out how our estimated energies fit to the experimental data (Fig.2). Let us start with the 'stretch' scenario. In the experiment (Figs.1,2) energy of the double helix opening is the work of external forces to pull the ball to some distance l. And the opening force can be calculated by formula (1). Opening energy of the double helix is the sum of the pair opening energy (E_{pair}) and the elastic energy of two single strands ($2E_{el}$) [3]. In the paper [3] it was estimated the total value of single strands extension for the average force of $\approx 13pN$, which is $l = 9.5\mathring{A}$. Since E_{elast} for the opening of poly-A·T and poly-G·C chains are approximately the same, we have $\Delta F_{str,so} = \Delta E_{str,so}/l$. So we have a value $\Delta F_{str} \approx 16$ pN, and $\Delta F_{so} \approx 2pN$. As it was mentioned in Sec.2, the experimental force difference between two plateaus on the force-distance curve, which corresponds to the difference between A·T and G·C opening forces, has a value $\Delta F_{\exp} \approx 1pN$ (Tabl.4). Apparently, the value is much closer to the value ΔF, calculated for DNA melting process, while the value ΔF_{so} is close to the observed value in the experiment [15]. It suggests that base pair opening in the unzipping of $\lambda-$phage DNA experiment at low pulling speeds [15] can take place not according to the 'stretch' scenario, but according to the 'stretch after opening' scenario.

4 Discussion and Conclusions

According to our estimations the mechanism which is proposed here describes the DNA double helix unzipping process that can take place according to two different scenarios.

The first from them ('stretch after opening') is connected with the base pair transition into the 'pre-opened' metastable state along the 'opening' pathway (Fig.5b), the second is the direct extension of the hydrogen bonds along the 'stretch' pathway (Fig.5a).

As the frequency of the bases vibrations in a pair along the 'opening' pathway ($\sim 20cm^{-1}$) is lower than along the 'stretch' pathway ($\sim 100cm^{-1}$) [36], in the first scenario bases in a pair need more time to separate and the first scenario is more probable to take place at low pulling velocities. It should be noted that the transition into metastable state can occur because of the structural changes of the DNA site situated between the unzipping fork and the dsDNA coil (Fig.1). As the result of our estimations it is shown that the experimental difference between two plateaus on the force-distance curve of the λ-DNA unzipping with low pulling velocities is connected with the realization of the 'stretch after opening' scenario.

In the works [23, 34] it is shown that the 'pre-opened' metastable state can be formed with the participation of water molecules (Fig.6b). It should be noted that our estimations for the difference in opening energies between A·T and G·C pairs for 'stretch' and 'stretch after opening' scenarios (ΔE_{str} and ΔE_{so}) are also appropriate for transition from the state where water is integrated to the external hydrogen bond ($N_6H\bullet\bullet\bullet O_4$ for A·T (Fig.6) and $O_6\bullet\bullet\bullet HN_4$ for G·C) [34, fig.4]. This is because the contribution from interaction of atoms forming the

outer hydrogen bond with a water molecule is the same for A·T and G·C base pairs. Further the process of base pairs opening along the 'stretch' pathway can take place cooperatively. Cooperativity can emerge because the energy difference for further opening between A·T and G·C pairs (ΔE_{so}) is very smal (Tabl.4, 'stretch after opening'). About the cooperativity of the unzipping process in this scenario argues the smooth descent of peaks on the force-distance curve (Fig.2) as well.

It is known that the unzipping fork is being blocked from time to time during the unzipping process that results in the peak occurrence on the force-distance curve [3]. In the present study it is shown that the reason of its blocking is the absence of the conditions of its propagation along the site situated between the fork and the dsDNA coil. This conditions are created after base pair transition into the 'pre-opened' state in this site.

At high pulling speeds ($>1\mu m/sec$) the process becomes to be non-equilibrium, about what argues the hysteresis occurrence on the force-distance curve [17]. In this case the rotational friction torque starts to play a significant role [8,17] and pairs do not have time to transit into the metastable state. In this case only the second scenario can take place when base pairs open along the 'stretch' pathway which has much higher vibrational frequency than the 'opening' pathway. The difference between the two plateaus on a force-distance dependence of the λ-phage DNA should be much bigger than in the first scenario (Tabl.4). The unzipping of short DNA hairpins can also take place according to this scenario because the values of the difference between opening forces of short poly-A·T and poly-G·C hairpins (Sec.2) and the ΔF_{str} (Tabl.4) are similar.

As it is seen from the experiment, in natural conditions the process takes place with small velocities ($\approx 10 bp/s$) [41]. Thus the 'stretch after opening' scenario is more probable to take place during the real *in vivo* unzipping processes such as transcription and translation.

References

[1] S.B. Smith, L. Finzi, C. Bustamante *Direct mechanical measurements of the elasticity of single DNA molecules by using magnetis beads*, Science **258**, 1122-1126 (1992).

[2] R.M. Simmons, J.T. Finer, S. Chu, J.A. Spudich *Quantitative measurements of force and displacement using an optical trap*, Biophys. J. **70**, 1813-1822 (1996).

[3] U. Bockelmann, B. Essevaz-Roulet, F. Heslot *DNA strand separation studied by single molecule force measurements*, Phys. Rev. E **58**(2) 2386-2394 (1998).

[4] R. Lavery, A. Lebrun, J.-F. Allemand, D. Bensimon, V. Croquette *Structure and mechanics of single biomolecules: experiment and simulation*, J. Phys. Condens. Matter **14**, 383-414 (2002).

[5] C. Bustamante and D. Keller *Scanning force microscopy in biology*, Phys. Today **48**(12), 32-38 (1995).

[6] C. Bustamante, S. B. Smith, J. Liphardt, D. Smith *Single-molecule studies of DNA mechanics*, Curr. Opin. Struct. Biol. **10**(3), 279-285 (2000).

[7] C. Bustamante, Z. Bryant, S. B. Smith *Ten years of tension: single-molecule DNA mechanics*, Nature **421**, 423-427 (2003).

[8] M. Manghi, , N. Destainville *Physics of base-pairing dynamics in DNA*, Phys. Rep. **631**, 141 (2016).

[9] R. Owczarzy, Y. You, B.G. Moreira, J.A. Manthey, L. Huang, M. A. Behlke, J. A. Walder *Effects of Sodium Ions on DNA Duplex Oligomers: Improved Predictions of Melting Temperatures*, Biochemistry **43**, 3537-3554 (2004).

[10] M.D. Frank-Kamenetskii, S. Prakash *Fluctuations in the DNA double helix: A critical review*, Phys. Life Rev. **11**, 153-170 (2014).

[11] R.M. Wartell, A.S. Benight *Thermal denaturation of DNA molecules: a comparison of theory with experiment*, Phys. Rept. **126** (2), 67-107 (1985).

[12] K.J. Breslauer, R. Frank, H. Blocker, L.A. Marky *Predicting DNA duplex stability from the base sequence*, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA **83**, 3746-3750 (1986).

[13] P. Yakovchuk, E. Protozanova, M.D. Frank-Kamenetskii *Base-stacking and base-pairing contributions into thermal stability of the DNA double helix*, Nucl. Acids Res. **34**(2), 564-574 (2006).

[14] M. Rief, H. Clausen-Schaumann, H.E. Gaub, *Sequence-dependent mechanics of single DNA molecules*, Nat. Struct. Biol. **6**, 346-349 (1999).

[15] B. Essevaz-Roulet, U. Bockelmann, F. Heslot *Mechanical separation of the complementary strands of DNA*, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA **94**, 11935-11940 (1997).

[16] U. Bockelmann, B. Essevaz-Roulet, F. Heslot *Molecular Stick-Slip Motion Revealed by Opening DNA with Piconewton Forces*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**(22), 4489-4492 (1998).

[17] Ph. Thomen, U. Bockelmann, F. Heslot *Rotational Drag on DNA: A Single Molecule Experiment*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**(24), 248102 (2002).

[18] U. Bockelmann, Ph. Thomen, B. Essevaz-Roulet, V. Viasnoff, F. Heslot *Unzipping DNA with Optical Tweezers: High Sequence Sensitivity and Force Flips*, Biophys. J. **82**, 1537-1553 (2002).

[19] U. Bockelmann, P. Thomen, and F. Heslot *Dynamics of the DNA Duplex Formation Studied by Single Molecule Force Measurements*, Biophys. J. **87**, 3388-3396 (2004).

[20] U. Bockelmann, V. Viasnoff *Theoretical Study of Sequence-Dependent Nanopore Unzipping of DNA*, Biophys. J. **94**, 2716-2724 (2008).

[21] J.M. Huguet, C.V. Bizarro, N. Forns, S.B. Smith, C. Bustamante, F. Ritort *Single-molecule derivation of salt dependent base-pair free energies in DNA*, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA **35**, 15431-15436 (2010).

[22] N.K. Voulgarakis, A. Redondo, A.R. Bishop, K.. Rasmussen *Probing the Mechanical Unzipping of DNA*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 248101 (2006).

[23] S.N. Volkov, A.V. Solovyov, *The mechanism of DNA mechanical unzipping*, Eur. Phys. J. D **54**, 657-666 (2009).

[24] M. Peyrard, A. Bishop *Statistical mechanics of a nonlinear model for DNA denaturation*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **62**, 2755-2758 (1989).

[25] C. Danilowicz, Y. Kafri, R.S. Conroy, V.W. Coljee, J. Weeks, M. Prentiss *Measurement of the Phase Diagram of DNA Unzipping in the Temperature-Force Plane*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 078101 (2004).

[26] J. SantaLucia *A unified view of polymer, dumbbell, and oligonucleotide DNA nearest-neighborthermodynamics*, Proc Natl Acad Sci USA **95**(4), 1460-1465 (1998).

[27] J. Liphardt, B. Onoa, S.B. Smith, I. Tinoco Jr., C. Bustamante *Reversible unfolding of single RNA molecules by mechanical force*, Science **292**, 733-737 (2001).

[28] C. Levinthal, H. Crane *On the unvinding of DNA*, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA **42** 436-438 (1956).

[29] S.N. Volkov, E.V. Paramonova, A.V. Yakubovich, A.V. Solovyov *Micromechanics of base pair unzipping in the DNA duplex*, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter **24**, 1-6 (2012).

[30] M. Egli, W. Saenger *Principles of nucleic acids structure*, Springer (1984).

[31] N.A. Slezkin *Dynamika viazkoj nezhimaemoj zhidkosti*, Moskov 184-186 (1955).

[32] P. Gross, N. Laurens, L.B. Oddershede, U. Bockelmann, E.J.G. Peterman, G.J.L. Wuite *Quantifying how DNA stretches, melts and changes twist under tension*, Nat. Phys. **7**, 731-736 (2011).

[33] R.E. Diekmann *Definitions and nomenclature of nucleic acid structure parameters*, EMBO **8**(1), 1-4 (1989).

[34] E.S. Kryachko, S.N. Volkov *Preopening of the DNA Base Pairs*, Int. J. Quantum Chem. **82**(4), 193-204 (2001).

[35] S.N. Volkov, A.V. Solovyov *To the understanding of phase diagram of DNA double helix unzipping*, Biophys. Bull. **19**(2), 5-12 (2007).

[36] S.N. Volkov, A.M. Kosevich *Theory of Low-Frequency Vibrations in DNA Macromolecules*, J. Biomolec. Struct. Dynamics **8**, 1069-1083 (1991).

[37] S.N. Volkov *Priodkrytoye sostoyaniye dvoynoy spirali DNK*, Mol. Biol. **29**(5), 1086-1094 (1995).

[38] U.V. Zefirov, P.M. Zorkyi *Van-der-Vaalsovy radiusy atomov v krystallokhimii i strukturnoy khimii*, Zhurnal strukturnoy khimii **15**, 118-122 (1974).

[39] V.I. Poltev, N.V. Shulyupina *Simulation of interactions between nucleic acid bases by refined atom-atom potential functions*, Journal of Biomolecular Structure and Dynamics **3**(4), 739-765 (1986).

[40] F. Ritort *Single-molecule experiments in biological physics: methods and applications*, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter **18**, 531-583 (2006).

[41] D. S. Johnson, L. Bai, B.Y. Smith, S. S. Patel, M. D.Wang *Single-Molecule Studies Reveal Dynamics of DNA Unwinding by the Ring-Shaped T7 Helicase*, Cell **129**, 1299-1309 (2007).